REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-19, and 21-44 were pending as of the final office action mailed September 18, 2007. This amendment is submitted with a Request for Continued Examination filed after a notice of appeal and pre-appeal brief were filed.

Claims 1-4, 6-19 and 21-44 are currently pending. Claims 1-4, 8, 12, 13, 15-19, 23, 27, 28, 30, and 33-36 are being amended. Claims 6, 7, 10, 14, 21, 22, 25, 29, 31, 32, 39, and 42 are being cancelled. No claims are being newly added. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments can be found within the applicant's specification at least at page 6, lines 18-22; page 7, lines 14-17 and 25-29; page 8, lines 9-25; and page 9, line 11 through page 10, line 10.

Reconsideration and reexamination of the application is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Interview Summary

The applicant thanks Examiners Nguyen and Bashore for the courtesy of the in-person interview on January 23, 2008. The time spent with the applicant's representatives Hans R. Troesch and Arriènne M. Lezak was greatly appreciated. During the interview the claims were discussed in light of the prior art. Recommendations were made by the examiners. Amendments have been made to the claims in view of those recommendations.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-19, 21-23, 25-30, and 33-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0066744 ("Jones") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,168,035 ("Bell).

Claims 9, 24, 31, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Jones and Bell in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0268304 ("Kuo").

Claim1

Claim 1 is rejected over Jones and Bell. Claim 1 has been amended to recite identifying a validation error of a particular kind in an XML electronic document, selecting a suggestion template from among multiple suggestion templates according to the particular kind of the

validation error in the XML document, and using the selected suggestion template to suggest to a user suggested corrections that are predefined in the template for the particular kind of validation error.

Bell teaches a means by which "a designer uses a forms designer application to build electronic forms from hierarchical data" (Bell, Abstract). Additionally, Bell teaches the display of hierarchical data, the facilitation of the selection of a portion of the hierarchical data, and the display of one or more transformation-language components associated with the selected portion of hierarchical data. Finally, Bell teaches the generation of an electronic form from the transformation-language components selected by the designer (Bell, Abstract).

The applicant respectfully submits the suggested transformation language components cited by the examiner to teach a predetermined suggestion template are merely suggestions to be used by a designer when generating an electronic form. These suggestions are unrelated to specific validation errors and they do not in any way include the logic necessary to implement the suggested corrections to the document in order to correct the identified non-conforming structural aspect in the document.

Moreover, though Jones teaches "error data [which] may also include further information related to the error, such as suggestions about how to possibly rectify the error which may be displayed to the user" (Jones, paragraph #0034), Jones does not in any way disclose that the suggestions are shown in the predetermined suggestion template and are associated with specific validation errors. Jones merely provides "suggestions about how to possibly rectify the error," which is not a suggestion that includes the logic necessary to implement the suggested changes to a document in order to correct an identified non-conforming structural aspect in the document. In other words, suggestions to possibly rectify an error do not disclose or suggest the capacity of the suggestion template to correct that particular error. In contrast, the claimed suggestion template includes the logic necessary to implement the suggested corrections in a document to correct a specific error (e.g., a non-conforming structural aspect).

Thus, the applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Jones and Bell, either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest the limitations of claim 1.

Claims 16 and 33

Claims 16 and 33 include features corresponding to those of claim 1 and were rejected for the same reasons. Therefore, claims 16 and 33 are allowable for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 13 and 28

Claims 13 and 28 include features corresponding to those of claim 1 and were rejected for the same reasons. Therefore, claims 13 and 28 are allowable for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1. Additionally, claims 13 and 28 recite the additional features of recursive validation. The applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Jones and Bell, either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest the limitations of claims 16 and 33.

Remaining Claims

The remaining claims depend from independent claims 1, 13, 16, 28, and 33 and are allowable for at least the reasons that apply to those independent claims.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The applicant respectfully requests that all pending claims be allowed.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's selecting come particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 15, 2008

/Arriènne M. Lezak/
Arriènne M. Lezak
Reg. No. 51,943

Customer No. 21876
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50448898.2.doc